

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
MARCH 8, 2013 IN THE STATE ROOM**

**Present:** Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson and Parliamentarian Charnovitz;  
Dean Johnson; Professors Acquaviva, Brazinsky, Castleberry, Cordes,  
Dickson, Garris, Greenberg, Hamano, Helgert, McAleavey, Newcomer,  
Parsons, Rehman, Shesser, Sidawy, Simon, Stott, Swaine, Swiercz, Williams,  
and Yezer

**Absent:** President Knapp; Deans Akman, Barratt, Brown, Dolling, Eskandarian,  
Feuer, Goldman, Guthrie, and Interim Dean Maggs; Professors Barnhill,  
Briscoe, Dhuga, Dickinson, Fairfax, Harrington, Kim, and Lantz

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Provost Lerman at 2:24 p.m. The Provost noted that President Knapp would be absent from the meeting as he was attending an event elsewhere on campus.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on February 8, 2013, were approved as distributed.

**CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

With the consent of the Senate, the order of the agenda was changed so that the Strategic Plan Implementation discussion could be heard as the first item of business.

**DISCUSSION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN**

Provost Lerman reported that the final copy of the Plan has been edited and is now in production. When it is available in page proofs it will be posted to the website as has been customary. The Plan will be distributed to members of the Board of Trustees immediately in electronic form and about a week later a teleconference with Board members will take place to give them an opportunity to ask questions and make final comments. Once this is done, the Board will conduct an e-mail vote to approve the final Plan instead of waiting until the May Board meeting to do this.

Following Plan approval, the implementation phase will begin. The Provost said it was his intention to choose a subset of the key recommendations and form working groups charged with developing detailed implementation plans. These groups will be comprised of

faculty, administrators, staff and students, with the relative composition of each depending upon the item to be implemented. Academic Affairs staff will also work with the groups on these tasks. In some cases plan development will also involve moving from a rough estimated budget to a real budget. The Provost said that he has been preserving flexibility in budgets going forward next year to provide banked resources to begin plan implementation, including money to facilitate the next planning phase and long-term money that can be committed over multiple years in the base budget for key items.

Provost Lerman noted, as he had before, that the Plan would evolve over time and that it is possible that not everything in the Plan may turn out to be something the University will ultimately choose to do. The next phase will involve engaging faculty with the administration, students and staff on laying out specific implementations.

The Provost said that he was looking forward very much to the next phase of this planning process. Many Senate members will likely be asked to be on one or more of the working groups, and of course, other faculty from the University will be invited to engage in these efforts. The leadership of the Student Association will be asked to nominate both undergraduate and graduate students to join the working groups. Provost Lerman concluded his remarks by inviting Senate members to e-mail him with any remaining questions or comments about the Plan as this process unfolds.

#### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

#### REPORT ON CORE INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Provost Lerman presented the report, which includes data about Faculty Counts and Characteristics (including a comparison of AAUP and Market Basket Salaries), Faculty Teaching Loads, the Enrollment Caps at the Foggy Bottom and Mount Vernon campuses, and Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollment Trends. A new section added this year provides data about GW students' co-curricular experiences and post-graduation plans. (The report is included with these minutes.)

Provost Lerman noted that this marks the third year he has presented this annual report. Information contained in the report is also presented annually to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, which is charged to report to the full Board on the metrics in it. The Report provided to the Senate is identical to that presented to the Board with the exception of essentially minor data corrections.

The Provost's comments in these minutes about the data presented follow the information that appears below about the various components of the Core Indicators report. Because so much data is presented in the report, not every category was discussed in detail.

Faculty Composition, Including the Number and Percentage of Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (excluding and including the MFA): pages 3 and 4 of the report.

**Total Number of Full-and Part-Time Faculty by School, (excluding and including the MFA), pages 5 and 6**

**Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track Regular, Active-Status Faculty by School and the Percentage of Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Regular, Active-Status Faculty by School: pages 7 and 8**

**Total Number and percentage of Full-time Female and Male Faculty, Percentage of Full-Time Female and Male Faculty by School: 2011, and the Percentage of Full-Time Underrepresented Minority Faculty, 2003, 2007, and 2011: pages 9 through 11**

**Faculty Teaching Loads: Average Academic Year Teaching Load in Course Hours of Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track faculty: page 13**

**Percentage of Students Enrolled in On-Campus Undergraduate Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty, Fall 2012, and Percentage of On-Campus Undergraduate Course Sections Taught by Full-time and Part-time Faculty, Fall 2012: pages 14 and 15**

**Tables reflecting this data for Graduate Courses and Sections: pages 16 and 17**

**Student-Faculty Ratio information is provided on page 18**

**Faculty Salary Information: Comparison of GW Faculty Salary Averages with the AAUP 60<sup>th</sup> Percentile Averages for the Academic Year 2011-12 (by School): page 20**

**Comparison of GW and Market Basket Professor, Associate and Assistant Professor Salary averages with the AAUP 80th Percentile Averages (2011-12): pages 21-23**

**Enrollment Caps Information, Foggy Bottom full-time Enrollment and Mount Vernon Campus Daily Headcount: pages 25-29**

**Enrollment in Undergraduate Degree Programs including Fall On-and Off-campus Undergraduate Enrollment and the Numbers of and Rates for Freshmen Applicants, Admits and Matriculants: pages 31-33**

**Combined Median SAT Math and Verbal Scores, and Math, Verbal and Writing Scores for Freshman Matriculants, and Median ACT Scores of same: pages 34-36**

**Enrollment Trends in Graduate On-Campus and Off-Campus Certificate and On-and Off-Campus Master's Degree Programs: pages 38-41**

**Numbers of and Rates for Master's Degree Applicants, Admits and Matriculants: page 42**

Median GRE Quantitative, Verbal and Writing Scores of Master's Degree Program Matriculants, and Median GMAT Scores of School of Business Master's Degree Program Matriculants can be found on pages 43-46

Enrollment information concerning Doctoral Degree Programs, including the Types of Active Doctoral Degrees, On-and Off-Campus Enrollment, Numbers of and Rates for Doctoral Degree Applicants, Admits and Matriculants, and the Median GRE Quantitative, Verbal and Writing Scores of Doctoral Degree Program Matriculants, pages 48-54

Enrollment data for Juris Doctor (J.D.) and Medical Doctor (M.D.) Programs including Fall Enrollment and relevant Median Test Scores, Numbers of and Rates for these Degree Applicants can be found on pages 56-62

A chart showing the Numbers of and Rates for Law-L.L.M and S.J.D. Degree Applicants, Admits and Matriculants is included on page 59

(New Section this year)

Co-Curricular Experiences and Post-Graduation Plans, including post-baccalaureate plans at Commencement, percentage of undergraduates employed full or part-time and post-baccalaureate plans 6 months after commencement, can be found beginning pages 64-66

Data based on the results of the Career Center Survey 2011 concerning activity by undergraduate degree recipients after graduating, and employment by sector, annual salary, and location can be found on pages 67 and 68

Other information concerning post-baccalaureate activity, including employment, along with the percentage of Master's level and Doctoral level students employed at graduation can be found on pages 69-74

Provost Lerman reviewed the first section of the report concerning Faculty Composition, which depicts the relative proportion of the full-time regular, active-status faculty, both tenured and tenure-track, and the non-tenure-track faculty over a ten-year window from 2003 to 2012. Looking first at the number and percentage of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, (excluding the MFA – this information is presented later in the report), there has been steady growth both in the numbers of regular faculty and a significant jump in year to year growth, particularly last year, in the percentage of those faculty who are tenured or tenure-accruing.

Professor Yezer asked if this has occurred because some contract lines are being converted to tenure-accruing positions, or because of some other mechanisms. Provost Lerman confirmed that this was one way in which the number of tenure lines has been increased. Usually a Dean will request on behalf of a department that a contract line be converted. If the request is granted, it does not mean the person who occupies the contract line automatically is appointed. In virtually all cases, a national search is required, and of course, the contract faculty member may apply for that position.



The data on the number of full- and part-time tenured and tenure-track faculty for 2012, excluding the MFA, shows an increase of 26 in the number of full-time faculty, and a reduction of 45 in the part-time faculty. When these numbers are calculated to include the same groups of faculty in the Medical Faculty Associates, the overall increase in full-time faculty amounts to 12, and the total number of part-time faculty decreased by 34. It should be noted that information in the table that includes the MFA information does not include research, visiting, special service, or affiliated faculty. In response to a question about whether these categories of faculty are represented in the Senate, the Provost said that it was his understanding that these faculty members may not be elected to the Faculty Senate as they are not classified as regular, active-status faculty in the *Faculty Code*. Another question was posed, inquiring if the part-time faculty were by definition members of the bargaining unit that represents adjunct faculty. Provost Lerman confirmed that they are, and consist of two types: those faculty who are part of the SEIU, and regular, part-time faculty who are also represented by the SEIU but have a somewhat different set of contractual terms and hold benefited positions, which other part-time faculty do not. So, overall, with the exception of the MFA, this would be the unionized part of the University's teaching faculty.

With respect to data including members of the Medical Faculty Associates about the number and percentage of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty (slide 4), as of 2012, approximately 65.3% are tenure track. This count does not include faculty who hold courtesy appointments, but does include all of the faculty who teach. Most of these faculty members are clinical faculty and most of their work takes place at the MFA. Not surprisingly, these clinical faculty members earn most of their income from their clinical work; the University compensates the MFA for the time they spend teaching. Also not surprisingly, virtually none of these faculty are tenured.

Turning briefly to the total number of full-time female and male faculty, Provost Lerman advised the Senate that Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion Terri Reed would be making a fuller report about this in more detail at the April meeting. He noted that the overall size of the faculty is growing, but the percentage of female faculty is growing faster than the number of male faculty, from 30% in 2002 to 40% today. This trend has been particularly pronounced in the last four years, and the expectation is that this will continue in future years.

The proportion of female to male faculty members varies widely by school. The School of Nursing faculty is exclusively female, not surprising in a profession that is still disproportionately female. At the other extreme, engineering is still a male-dominated faculty in numerical terms. Columbian College has a ratio that is very close to the University as a whole, as does the University's other largest school, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

The Provost touched briefly on the data detailing the percentage of full-time underrepresented minority faculty for the years 2003, 2007, and 2011, noting again, that Vice Provost Reed would report more fully on this at the next Senate meeting. This data does not change very much from year to year, and so three years are reported in each Core

**Indicators Report.** The big picture is that the University has continued to struggle to recruit Hispanic and African American faculty members. This is not surprising given that these groups are underrepresented among Ph.d. recipients.

With respect to teaching loads, the report details the average academic year teaching load in course hours of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty by school from 2005 through 2011. Over this period, there is a pretty consistent pattern – most of the non-tenure-track faculty teach more than the tenure-track faculty. Overall, the average tenure-track faculty member teaches close to ten credit hours, and the average non-tenure-track faculty member is teaching close to 13.

In terms of the percentage of students enrolled in on-campus undergraduate courses taught by full-and part-time faculty during Fall 2012, Provost Lerman pointed out that this data varies pretty widely by school for a variety of complicated reasons. The highest percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty is in the Engineering School. In terms of the total for five schools that offer undergraduate courses, approximately 58.2% of courses taught last fall were taught by full-time faculty and about 41% were taught by part-time faculty.

The Report also breaks out information on the percentage of on-campus undergraduate course sections taught by full-and part-time faculty as well as for on-campus graduate course sections. About 64 to 65% of the University's graduate courses are taught by full-time faculty and 35 to 36% by part-time faculty members. Lastly, the Provost said he was somewhat surprised that the student-faculty ratio was higher for 2011 than for the previous three years, from 13.0 to 13.7. He added that he thought this was attributable in large part to a larger graduate enrollment in 2011. As the University rolls out additional faculty lines in connection with the Strategic Plan implementation, the expectation is that this ratio will return to a lower level again.

The Provost next reviewed faculty salary averages for the three professorial ranks: assistant, associate, and full professor. Two benchmarks are employed for these comparisons i.e., AAUP 60<sup>th</sup> and 80<sup>th</sup> percentile averages, and GW salaries in three ranks compared to the University's market basket schools. The Senate will recall that these schools were selected as comparators by the Faculty Senate and the University's Board of Trustees.

A longstanding goal for the University has been to reach the point that, in all ranks and in all schools, the average faculty salaries would not be less than the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile of the AAUP averages. This goal has been achieved in all except three instances, those being full professors in CCAS, and assistant professors in CCAS and GSEHD. These three instances need to be looked at more closely.

A second comparison of salary averages at the three ranks with the AAUP 80<sup>th</sup> percentile averages and GW's market basket school salary averages is provided in the report. The goal with respect to the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile is that average salaries will meet or exceed the AAUP 80<sup>th</sup> percentile. The average salary of full professors at the University (excluding the

Medical faculty) exceeds the AAUP 80<sup>th</sup> percentile, and GW ranks 10 of 15 on this metric in comparison to its market basket schools. At the associate professor rank, GW's faculty salary averages exceed the AAUP 80<sup>th</sup> percentile and GW ranks 7 of 15 on this measure. At the assistant professor rank, GW's faculty salary averages miss the AAUP 80<sup>th</sup> percentile by a mere \$36 per annum, and GW ranks 10 of 15 on this measure.

Provost Lerman briefly reviewed the information in the report concerning how enrollment caps for the Foggy Bottom and Mount Vernon campuses are calculated. Turning first to the cap at Foggy Bottom which is measured in full-time student equivalents (FTEs), the number of full-time students is added to the part-time graduate students' credits (divided by 9). To this sum are added other part-time students' credits (divided by 12). According to the agreement with the District of Columbia, a number of subtractions are made from this number (see page 25) to arrive at the final Foggy Bottom student FTE. The maximum allowable under the agreement is 16,553; for 2012, the student FTE equaled 16,168, for a 97.67 utilization rate.

The enrollment cap for the Mount Vernon campus is calculated differently. This is a headcount of FTE students physically on the campus by each day of the week (excluding Saturday and Sunday) and the number cannot exceed 1,650. Not surprisingly, there is excess capacity on Fridays when, for the Spring and Fall 2012 semesters, utilization was little over 70% of the allowable number.

The next data sets in the report describe enrollment trends in undergraduate and graduate enrollments. Undergraduate enrollments are now a little below 10,000 (9,761) and have fluctuated between 9,500 and that number for the last ten years. Ideally, these enrollments would fluctuate between 9,800 and 10,000. Undergraduate off-campus enrollment is relatively small in comparison, and has a very modest influence on total revenues and teaching loads.

Professor Swiercz asked where distance students are counted. Provost Lerman responded that they would be counted as off-campus and are aggregated in the data reported. Professor Swiercz pointed out that the growth factor in these enrollments particularly in the Business School and in health care is quite large. The new initiative in the Business School is moving toward more undergraduate enrollments, especially in summer. Provost Lerman said he thought it might be useful in future reports to break out the data on distance learning separately. He also observed that on-campus summer enrollments have been declining, but online summer enrollments have grown considerably.

Provost Lerman briefly summarized the data on freshman applicants, admits, and matriculants. A total of 21,756 applications were received for the entering class, and this number has risen slightly in the last three years. Although some concerns have been expressed that the *U.S. News and World Report's* decision to unrank GW would negatively impact applications, there is both anecdotal and numerical evidence that this has not had any measurable impact on the University's undergraduate enrollments. Approximately 7,197 of applicants were admitted for enrollment in Fall, 2013, and that yielded an entering class of about 2,387 students, so the yield is very close to a third.

With respect to combined math and verbal SAT scores, these numbers have been essentially steady, ranging between 1,290 and 1,300 for the past 8 years. These scores are scored in ten point increments, so the ten point difference between last year and this is really the smallest drop that can be calculated. A breakout of the SAT scores by math, verbal and writing measures shows that, over time, writing scores have been going up steadily, despite a slight retreat this year. Overall, the applicant pool last year looked very similar to the year before and the Provost said he thought that this year's pool looks very similar to those of prior years.

Turning to enrollment trends at the graduate certificate and Master's levels, off-campus numbers tend to be much higher than those on campus. Most of the certificate programs are taught in one of the University's off-campus facilities in Arlington, Alexandria, the VS&T campus and Hampton Roads. This is significant because of the enrollment cap at Foggy Bottom and as a result, each school will get an allocation of slots in the admissions process for graduate students in Foggy Bottom.

On-campus Master's degree program enrollment has remained essentially stable for the past three years, while off campus programs (some of these involving distance learning) have grown significantly in the last year, and will continue to expand quite considerably. Overall, the University received over 16,000 applications for Master's programs. Of these 7,948 were admitted, for a yield of 3,311 last year.

Provost Lerman noted that a correction was recently made in counting on campus doctoral program enrollment data, making it appear that these have dropped significantly. This is because a coding error was discovered in which a number of doctoral students studying off-campus were counted as on-campus students. The recharacterization of these enrollments for 2011 and 2012 thus reflects a reduction in on-campus enrollments and an increase in off-campus students, so particular attention should be paid to the total number of graduate enrollments in both places. Of 4,873 applicants for doctoral programs, 18.4% were accepted for 2012 for a yield rate of 50.5%.

At the Law School year, there was a drop in enrollments for the Juris Doctor program as a decision was made not to lower standards for admission. On the other hand, enrollment in the LLM programs rose somewhat. At the Medical School, over 10,000 completed applications were received. 316, or 3% of all M.D. applicants were admitted, and of those 175 opted to come to GW, or a little over half the field.

New information is included in the Report for the first time this year on Co-Curricular Experiences and Post-Graduation Plans. This section was added at the request of the Board of Trustees as it is something the Board is very interested in. This section presents information from the Career Center survey of 2011 and presents data about students' activities after graduation, their employment (by sector and industry, location, and annual salary) as well as the percentage of graduating seniors who had internship, paid employment or community service engagement. Information concerning the percentage of post-baccalaureates who have employment related to their majors 6 months after



commencement, the distribution of post-baccalaureates full-time annual salary after commencement, and the percentage of master's and doctoral level students employed at graduation can be found on pages 69-74.

In 2011, approximately 40% of GW undergraduates were employed part- or full-time upon graduation; six months later, that percentage rose to over 60%. For the year 2012, 38% of undergraduates expect to be thus employed at graduation, with the final percentage to be determined six months from the May commencement. For Master's level students employed at graduation, the percentage for 2011 was 61%, and for Doctoral level students 74%. The percentage of Master's level students employed is expected to remain constant for 2012; for Doctoral level students, the percentage is expected to rise to 78% this year.

Professor Parsons inquired about the omission of a usual feature of the Report which provides information about what percent of the freshman class graduated in the top tenth of their high school classes. He added that he thought it would be useful to go back and reconstruct this data in view of GW's unranking this year by *U.S. News and World Report*. Provost Lerman advised this data has been reconstructed for the past two years, but this proved very expensive to reconstruct because it required going through each application of admitted freshmen to obtain information that is not included on high school transcripts. Vice Provost Maltzman added that high school ranking is not data that GW has been using in making admissions decisions, because it is not a measure of student quality in any way. Associate Provost Beil agreed with the proposition that even if this were done, no useful information would be obtained. Summing up, Provost Lerman said that GW has data for 2011 and 2012, and will calculate this for 2013.

Professor Sidawy drew attention to information not included in the Cored Indicators Report that he thought worth mentioning. This year, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences received over 4,000 applicants for 40 positions, and in surgery 1,049 applications were received for 4 positions. He added that he wondered that since this is part of graduate education if it should not be included in the Report. Provost Lerman said he would be happy to request this information from the Medical School (it is not at present reported to the University with other graduate enrollment data) and include it in future reports once it is made available.

Professor Greenberg asked if the Foggy Bottom cap is fixed in perpetuity or is something that can be renegotiated with the District in the future. Provost Lerman responded that the University is committed to the agreement and the District has no obligation to renegotiate it. Going forward, if City officials were interested in and willing to revisit this issue, he said he would be happy to engage with them.

Professor Brazinsky said he noticed that the number of faculty has increased over the years, and this is good thing; he asked the Provost if he saw a time when it would be right to stop increasing the number of faculty. Provost Lerman responded that the University does not have an absolute number; rather it depends upon available resources, including space and financing. The goal is to expand the faculty at a rate where it is possible to hire them and provide the resources they need to be productive and successful.



**GENERAL BUSINESS**

**I. NOMINEES FOR ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE 2013-14 SESSION**

Professor Castleberry moved the nominations of the following faculty members to the Committee:

Charles A. Garris (SEAS) Convener; Bruce Dickson (ESIA)  
Jennifer Frey (GSEHD), Mary Granger (SB), Jessica Green (SON),  
Alan Greenberg (SPHHS), Kathryn Newcomer (CCAS),  
Margaret Plack (SMHS), Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. (GWLS)

The entire slate was elected.

**II. ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES**

Professor Castleberry moved the nomination of Professor Kim Roddis to the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, and Professor Roddis was elected.

**III. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Professor Castleberry presented the Report included with these minutes.

**IV. INTERIM REPORT OF THE LIBRARIES COMMITTEE**

Professor McAleavey reminded the Senate that the Senate Libraries Committee had instigated a process that resulted in the appointment by the Provost of a task force to conduct a strategic review of Gelman, Eckles and the VSTC libraries, also known collectively as The George Washington Libraries (GWL). This is a project still in process of particular interest to the Senate and is really going to be very important to the University as a whole. Professor McAleavey noted that Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning Steve Ehrmann, who is Co-Chair of the Strategic Review Committee, was present at the Senate meeting.

One of the things that happened recently was that two outside consultants were brought in to look objectively at the situation of the GWL. The conversation the Senate Libraries Committee was privileged to have with those consultants, Jim Neal from Columbia and Karin Wittenborg from the University of Virginia, revealed that from the viewpoint of two apparently objective outside observers, Gelman Library is really in bad shape and is in need of attention for funds for collections as well as for staff, space, and

other items. The consultants are expected to issue a report to the Committee which should arrive in a week or so and the hope is that the Committee itself will be issuing a report for the Provost by the end of the spring semester.

As background, Professor McAleavey noted that for the last seventeen years or so Gelman has received only modest occasional increases in its collections budget. During this period the cost of materials, online subscriptions, and journals of various kinds has risen on average 7% per year. The result is, of course, that Gelman has been deteriorating in caliber as a resource for the University's undergraduate and graduate students and the faculty. Professor McAleavey noted that it seems that the University's senior administrators are aware of the seriousness of this problem and dedicated to solving it. While the search for a new University Librarian is still in process, fundraising to improve Gelman will certainly be a key component of this individual's responsibilities.

Professor Simon noted that medical faculty obtain most of their material online at this point and do not go to Gelman very often, and he asked how much of the physical plant of the building is now utilized. Librarian Deborah Bezanson was present at the meeting and said that Gelman is actually quite busy, so much so that complaints were received that it managed to stay open only until 8 p.m. on the recent snow day when the University was officially closed. Typically, 8,000 to 9,000 people each day come to Gelman during the academic year, with summer activity a bit quieter. In response to other questions, Librarian Bezanson responded that comparative data on Gelman use is not available over the last ten years, and that GWorld cards, which are used to enter Gelman, do not reveal if those using the building are students or faculty.

Professor Castleberry asked if the Committee itself is addressing the status of the library, with particular reference to any requirements which may need to be met as the University achieves its research aspirations. Professor McAleavey said he would be very interested to see the consultant's report, because at present Gelman really more closely resembles an undergraduate library than a research library. Provost Lerman observed that there are many more scholarly resources than those provided by Gelman which can be utilized by the University community, such as the Library of Congress and government agencies. These are important resources that augment services provided by Gelman to faculty and students.

#### V. PROVOST'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman said he wanted to reinforce Professor Castleberry's comments concerning opportunities to meet new faculty. He agreed that it is a great pleasure to meet these newcomers, whether at the new faculty orientation and reception at his house on the Mount Vernon campus, or at the most recent breakfast meeting. These are people who are very enthusiastic about being at the University, and they are enjoying their experiences. They are in that early phase of their career when they are learning how to teach and how to do research, and clearly many of them have stellar careers in front of them.

Provost Lerman added that he hosts a dinner twice a semester at his house and invites a more or less random group of faculty to get together and talk. Recently on one such occasion, the discussion was focused on the Strategic Plan. This has been discussed quite often in the last 18 months, and so the conversation was opened up to query faculty about significant issues that they would like to talk about with the Provost and the other faculty present. Overall, the feedback from this session was quite interesting, and it is evident that faculty members enjoy the opportunity to interact with colleagues from different disciplines.

One point that was raised was that it would be extraordinarily helpful if it were easier to gather faculty across Schools who have some shared intellectual interests. As an example, there was a younger faculty member whose work is in geographic information systems (GIS). It turns out that these systems have applicability to the work of essentially every one of the University's schools. He was a little frustrated by the difficulty in finding like-minded souls so that they could begin to think about courses and research projects on which they could collaborate. The Provost said his office will begin working on finding ways to overcome the barriers faculty face in finding each other in order not only to facilitate interdisciplinary teaching and research, but also to build a closer sense of community among faculty members from different schools.

#### VI. CHAIR'S REMARKS

As previously noted, President Knapp was absent from the meeting, so no Chair's remarks were made.

#### BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

There were no brief statements or questions.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*

Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

## REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

8 March, 2013

Michael S. Castleberry, Chair

### ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### Reports

We have scheduled Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion Terri Reed for the April meeting to present the report on the Status of Women and Faculty of Color. We are requesting that Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz come and discuss the University budget and his views on the increases in benefits costs to faculty as a result of rising health care costs at the April or May meeting of the Faculty Senate.

#### Other Matters

At its meeting in February, the Executive Committee discussed the implementation of the Strategic Plan once a final review is completed by the Board of Trustees. After approval by the Board a plan will be implemented that will address specific topics of the Strategic Plan with participation by the schools affected by said topics. Membership would be drawn from the faculty, students, and members of the administration depending on the nature and jurisdiction of the topics, e.g. cross-collaboration in research and teaching, etc.

The administration informs us that we are 'close' to finalizing the Vice-Provost for Finance as well as the Dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences searches. We look forward to welcoming these new additions to the university community.

The Provost hosted the second annual breakfast for new faculty on March seventh. We meet new faculty in August to welcome them to the University in an orientation guided by Vice-Provost Martin that includes presentations by the Provost, officers of the administration, benefits and personnel staff, and includes a presentation by the Chair of the Executive Committee on governance and related matters. We follow that meeting up with the breakfast to check in with new faculty to ensure that the information we're providing them was correct and to ascertain any difficulties they have encountered in adjusting to life at the University. This group gave a particularly positive report on their period of acclimation to university life and were equally positive about their initial semester and a half of teaching. They are a very impressive group of professionals.

The nominating committee approved today will meet to select nominees for membership on the Executive Committee for 2013-2014 including the Chair of the Executive Committee. The slate will be presented and voted on at the April meeting. The April meeting of the Executive Committee on April 26<sup>th</sup> will be the combined 2012-13 and 2013-14 committees and committee membership nominees will be made at that time for action at the May meeting. Forms for service on committees have been distributed previously and we encourage you to invite faculty to participate. Committee service plays a crucial role in the Senate's contribution to shared governance, so we hope members of the Senate continue to volunteer for service and encourage their faculty colleagues to do so as well. Please note



that, with the exception of the Dispute Resolution Committee, tenure is NOT required for Committee service.

Personnel Matters

Nonconcurrences

The nonconcurrence in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences from last summer has yet to be concluded.

Grievances

There is a grievance resulting from a nonconcurrence in the School of Business which was referred to the Dispute Resolution Committee and is in process at this time. A second grievance was just referred to the Dispute Resolution Committee from Columbian College of Arts and Sciences. We will keep the Senate informed about the progress of these cases.

There are no new nonconcurrences to report at this time.

Next Meeting of the Executive Committee

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for March 22, 2013. Please submit resolutions, reports and any other matters for consideration prior to that meeting. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on April 12, 2013.

Next week is the university spring break and we hope you enjoy some free time before we march to the end of this academic year.



**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**  
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

February 28, 2013

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, March 8, 2013, at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor

**AGENDA**

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of February 8, 2013  
(minutes to be distributed)
3. Introduction of Resolutions
4. Report on Core Indicators of Academic Excellence: Provost Lerman
5. Discussion on implementation of the Strategic Plan
6. General Business
  - (a) Nominees for election of faculty members to the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee for the 2013-14 Session:  
Charles A. Garris (SEAS) Convener; Bruce Dickson (ESIA)  
Jennifer Frey (GSEHD), Mary Granger (SB), Jessica Green (SON),  
Alan Greenberg (SPHHS), Kathryn Newcomer (CCAS),  
Margaret Plack (SMHS), Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. (GWLS)
  - (b) Election of faculty members to Senate Standing Committees  
Fiscal Planning and Budgeting: Kim Roddis
  - (c) Report of the Executive Committee: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
  - (d) Interim Report of the Senate Libraries Committee  
Professor McAleavey, Libraries Committee Chair
  - (e) Provost's Remarks
  - (f) Chair's Remarks
7. Brief Statements (and questions)
8. Adjournment

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary